

A Definite Use of Early Greek tis

Gary B. Holland

University of California, Berkeley

Early Greek tis is characterized in the standard handbooks and lexica as an interrogative/indefinite pronoun (so Schwyzler-Debrunner 1950:216ff., Meillet-Vendryes 1927:535, Liddell-Scott-Jones s.v. tis).¹ In most environments these two uses are clearly differentiated; interrogative tís is accented and may occur in clause-initial position, whereas unaccented tis is indefinite and necessarily postpositive:

- 1) tís t'ár sphōe theōn éridi ksunéēke mákhesthai?
 who ptc. them gods strife sent to fight
 'Who of the gods sent them together to fight in strife?'
 (Il.1.8)
- 2) hōde dé tis eípesken
 thus ptc. someone would say
 'Thus someone would speak.' (Il.7.201)

Indefinite tis is also used as an adjective, with both nouns and demonstratives:

- 3) all' áge dé tina mántin ereíomen
 but come on ptc. some seer let us ask
 'But come on let us ask some seer.' (Il.1.62)
- 4) hoútós tis, Diómēdes, apò stratoũ érkhetai anér
 this some Diomedes from army comes man
 'This (is) some man, Diomedes, coming from the army.'
 (Il.10.341)

A further use of postpositive tis is with relative pronouns. Here it is generally regarded as making the relative indefinite or generalizing (Chantraine 1948:479, Schwyzler-Debrunner 1950: 643), so that hós 'who' contrasts with hóstis 'whoever':²

- 5) Iphidámas Antēnorídēs eūs te mégas te,
 Iphidamas son of Antenor good and big and
hós tráphē en Thréikēi eribōlaki, mētéri mēlōn
 who was nourished in Thrace fertile mother of flocks
 'Iphidamas son of Antenor, good and large,
 who was nourished in fertile Thrace, mother of flocks.'
 (Il.11.221-222)
- 6) ou gár éēn hós tís sphin epì stíkhas hēgēsaito
 not for was anyone who them into ranks would lead
 'For there was not anyone who would lead them into (their)
 ranks.' (Il.2.687)

In other Indo-European languages reflexes of the stem *k^wi- (the direct antecedent of Greek ti-s)³ are used in indefinite, in interrogative and in relative functions. For example, in Hittite, kuiš appears in all these uses:

- 7) U-NU-TE^{MES}-ia-kán ku-e an-da-an na-at ša-ra-a da-a-i
utensils -and-ptc. which inside con.-them prev. takes
'and which utensils (are) inside, them he takes up.'
(Pāpanikri I 8, cited by Hahn 1946)
- 8) ku-iš am-me-el a-ap-pa-an LUGAL-uš ki-i-ša-r[i]
who(ever) me after king becomes
. . .
na-an ne-pí-ša-aš ^DIŠKUR-aš ḫa-az-zi-e-e[t-tu]
con.-him heaven Storm God let strike
'Who(ever) becomes king after me . . . let the Storm God of
heaven strike him.' (Anitta Rev. 49f.)

(An interrogative use is illustrated in Ex. (26).) In early Latin, quis appears in these values:

- 9) Naucratem quem convenire volui, in navi non erat
Naucrates whom meet I wanted on ship not was
'What Naucrates I wanted to meet was not on board.'
(Plaut. Amph. 1009, cited and translated by Sturtevant 1930)
- 10) roget quis
may ask someone
'Someone may ask.' (Ter. Eun. 511)
- 11) quid faceret?
'What would he do?' (Plaut. Rud. 379)

Although virtually all IE languages use reflexes of *k^wi- in indefinite and in interrogative functions and maintain the distinction in word order between these two uses, they differ in the stem they employ as a relative. Hittite and Latin (with the Italic dialects) use reflexes of *k^wi-, while Greek, Indic and Iranian use reflexes of *i_o-. Scholars have been divided on which element to reconstruct to Indo-European as the archetypal relative. The classical view was that *i_o- was the relative in Indo-European, and that the relative uses of *k^wi- were to be derived from interrogative uses (so Delbrück 1900:389-391, 405-406, Meillet 1965:166-168). According to these authors, this development was an independent and parallel occurrence in the languages in which it took place. The mechanism for this development will have been the ambiguity of certain types of indirect questions.

Meillet maintains (1965:167) that this type of reanalysis is the only type that is actually observable in the attested development of certain IE languages. In Classical Greek, sentences of the type illustrated by

- 12) . . . histórei, tí soi phílon
 ask what to you dear
 '. . . ask what(ever) (is) dear to you.'
 (Soph. El. 316, cited in Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:644)

are generally regarded as the point of departure for the later Hellenistic use of accented tís as a relative pronoun:

- 13) hótí tí théleis práksō
 since what you want I will do
 'since I will do what you want.'
 (Papyrus cited in Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:644)

E. H. Sturtevant (1930) on the other hand attempted to show that the stem *k^wi- had relative value in Indo-European (and in Indo-Hittite as well, but that need not concern us here). He argued that the position defended by Meillet (and by Meillet-Vendryes) did not take proper account of the Hittite data, and that the correspondences between Hittite and Latin (with Oscan and Umbrian) were so exact that they could not be attributed to independent but parallel development.⁴ In Sturtevant's view, both *i_o- and *k^wi- had relative value in Indo-European, with *i_o- used when the relative had a definite antecedent, and *k^wi- used when the antecedent was indefinite (1930:148). Sturtevant further thought that Homeric evidence for the use of tís as a relative was to be found in

- 14) alloũ d' oú teu oĩda teũ àn klutà teúkhea
 other ptc. neg. some I know whose ptc. famous arms
 dúō
 I might put on
 'Other man know I none whose noble armor I might put on.'
 (Il.18.192; Lang, Leaf and Myers' translation quoted by Sturtevant 1930:148)

Sturtevant's theory by no means excludes a secondary origin for the relative use of *k^wi-; it merely shifts the locus for such a development back into Indo-European. E. Adelaide Hahn (1946) attempted to substantiate exactly this point on the basis of Hittite evidence. She maintained that "[i]n Hittite a subordinate relative clause can scarcely be distinguished from a coordinate indefinite clause," so that a sentence like Ex. (7) could mean either "some utensils are there, and he picks them up" or "which utensils are there, these he picks up" (1946:71).

A marginal use of Greek tís that has not been considered in this context sheds some light on this problem:

- 15) ẽn dé tís en Tróessi Dárēs
 was ptc. tís among Trojans Dares
 'There was tís Dares among the Trojans.' (Il.5.9, cf. also 10.314, 17.575)

- 16) éske tis entháde mántis anér, ēús te mégas te,
 was tis here seer man good and large and
 Télemos Eurumídēs, hós . . .
 Telemos Eurumos' son who
 'There was here tis seer, good and large, Telemos son of
 Eurumos, who. . . .' (Od.9.508)
- 17) Elpénōr de tis éske neótatos
 Elpenor ptc. tis was very young
 'There was tis very young Elpenor.' (Od.10.552)
- 18) éske tis Kapheūs (cod. skapheūs) wanássōn
 was tis Kapheus ruling
 'There was tis Kapheus ruling.' (Alcman 74 Page)
- 19) ãn de tis en tēi stratiáī Xenophōn Athēnaĩos
 was ptc. tis in the army Xenophon the Athenian
 'There was in the army tis Xenophon the Athenian.'
 (Xen. An. III 1,4)

This construction is well-attested in Homer and in later Greek literature. In these examples we clearly have the unaccented postpositive tis, and virtually all scholars claim that it is indefinite as well, although most admit that the indefiniteness is a matter of degree. For example, Kühner-Gerth (1955 [=1904]: 662) state, "Oft bezieht sich tis auf vorher genannte oder bekannte Personen," and Schwyzer-Debrunner (1950:214) say that tis is often "von nur relativer Unbestimmtheit," while Humbert (1954:26) teaches that "il [tis] suppose souvent un objet connu, au moins partiellement: ainsi il fait allusion à une 'certaine' personne qu'on ne veut pas nommer." In the function illustrated by Exx. (15-19), tis is usually translated as 'a certain.' Such a translation has, however, no explanatory value; it is merely a convention.

Explanations for the use of tis with proper names may be classified into two groups. The first is represented by Meillet-Vendryes who maintain that in sentences of this type "l'indéfini tis et les substantifs avec lesquels il a l'air de s'accorder sont en réalité indépendants; il y a seulement apposition" (1927:535-536). Presumably Meillet would translate "there was someone, (by name) NN." Sentences of a closely related structure do exist in Greek:

- 20) ãn dé tis en mnēstērsin anēr athemístia eidós,
 was ptc. tis among suitors man unjustness knowing
 Ktésippos d' ónom' éske
 Ktesippos ptc. name was
 'There was among the suitors tis man knowing unjust things,
 and he was Ktesippos by name.' (Od.20.287-288)

But even the sentences which include anér 'man' show that tis in these constructions is an adjective, and not a pronoun. tis is also used with river and city names (with the rivers and cities

specified by potamós and pólis). Meillet's explanation is another instance of his "appositional" approach to IE syntax, and is to be rejected. E. Adelaide Hahn's monograph on naming constructions (1969) unfortunately does not contain a discussion of the type represented by Exx. (15-19).

The second group of explanations views this use of tis as the result of a gradual extension of its uses with limited groups as in Akhaiōn tis 'someone of the Achaeans' or theōn tis 'someone of the gods' (so Humbert 1954:26f.). Here the basic notion of indefiniteness is maintained, since the actual agent is unnamed although the range of possibilities is quite limited. For these scholars, examples of the type represented by

- 21) kaí tis theòs hēgemóneue
'and tis god was leading.' (Od.9.142)

are the bridge from the theōn tis type to that of Exx. (15-19), since the speaker might have a specific god in mind, but be reluctant to name him or her for one reason or another. Implicit in this explanation too is the assumption that tis is basically a pronoun and that its use with a proper name is semantically anomalous.

Sentences of the ēn dé tis NN type are always presentational in Greek; they serve to introduce a character (or a place) into the narrative where they occur, and the character introduced is invariably the subject of a following story. A comparison of

- 22) éske d' en Tróessi Podēs, huiòs Eētiōnos
was ptc. among Trojans Podēs son Eetion
'There was among the Trojans Podēs, Eetion's son.'
(Il.17.575; two codices have ēn dé tis en T. . .)

with Exx. (15-19) shows that tis is optional in these presentational sentences. Many of the sentences are marked overtly as presentational by the initial verb. This feature seems to occur in folk tales, in popular stories and fables in almost all IE languages with the exception of Hittite. Typical examples are

- 23) āsīd rājā Nalo nāma
was king Nala name
'There was a king, Nala by name.'
(Nala Episode of Mahābhārata)

in Sanskrit, and

- 24) bùvo karāliaus dukté
was king's daughter
'There was a king's daughter.'
(Žaltys ir mergaitė, ed. Senn 1957)

from a Lithuanian fairy tale (see Kieckers 1911:55ff. on the

question of initial placement of existential verbs in IE). Comparable Hittite examples exist, but they do not have initial position of the verb:

- 25) URU-aš ŠUM-an-še-it Šu-du-ul . . . e-eš-zi nu-kán
 city name - its Sudul is con.-ptc.
 še-ir LÚ-aš ᵐAp-pu ŠUM-an-še-it
 adv. man Appu name - his
 'There is a city Šudul by name, and up (there) (is)
 a man Appu by name.' (Appu I 7f.)

A Hittite example which may have the same structure as Exx. (15-19)
 is

- 26) ¹Ma-ri-ja-aš ku-iš e-eš-ta na-aš ku-e-da-ni
 Marijas kuis was con.-he what
 ud-d[a-ni-i še-ir (BA.UG₆)]
 matter postpos. died
 'Marijaš kuiš was. And for what reason did he die?'
 (Hjuqq. III 53, ed. Friedrich 1930)

The editor of the text that contains Ex. (26) treated it as a question, 'Was Marijaš war?', although he admitted the difficulty of the passage (Friedrich 1930:157). But if the first clause were a question, the kuiš should precede the noun, and not follow it. Furthermore, since Marijaš is mentioned here for the first time in this text, and is the subject of a short moralistic tale, it seems to be preferable to take it as presentational, especially in view of the Greek examples, and translate it as 'There was a certain Marijaš.'

Relative sentences in Indo-European had much the same structure as that of Exx. (7), (9) and

- 27) hós ke theoís epipeíthētai, mála t' ékluon autoũ
 who ptc. gods obeys very much ptc. they hear him
 'Who obeys the gods, they listen to him very much.' (Il.1.218)
- 28) kourēn hēn ára moi géras éxelon huēs Akhaiōn
 girl which ptc. for me prize chose sons of Achaeans
 dourì d' emōi kteátissa
 spear ptc. my I acquired
 'Which girl the sons of the Achaeans chose for me (as) prize,
 (her) I acquired with my spear.' (Il.16.56-57)

These relative sentences are bipartite: they consist of a grammatically independent preposed clause containing a relative adjective and an instance of the relativized noun; this 'relative' clause is in turn followed by a resumptive 'main' clause. The linkage between the relative and the main clauses is accomplished in two ways: first, by the presence of the relative marker in the

preposed clause, and second, by ordinary anaphoric processes (a discussion of some of these points and a working bibliography are in Holland and Ickler 1978). The anaphoric procedures utilized are either a repetition of the relativized noun or its substitution by a resumptive pronoun, or a complete omission of any overt anaphoric reference. Sentences of the structure of Ex. (28) are archaisms in Greek; the usual structure of a relative sentence may be illustrated by

- 29) Idomeneùs d' ára Phaíston enérato Méionos huiòn
 Idomeneus ptc. ptc. Phaistos slew of Meion son
 Bórou, hòs ek Tárnēs eribólakos eilēlóuthēi
 Boros' who from Tarne fertile had come
 'Idomeneus slew Phaistos son of Boros from Meion who had
 come from fertile Tarne.' (Il.5.43-44)

This type of construction is characterized by relative pronouns rather than relative adjectives, and by postposed relative clauses modifying head nouns. The relative pronoun itself is the anaphoric element.

Virtually all relative sentences in Hittite are of the type of Ex. (7), and Carol Justus (1976) has argued that the primary function of *kuiš* is to introduce new nouns into the discourse and to establish *its* nouns as topics; these topic markers will have been reanalyzed as relatives as the language changed from topic-prominent to subject-prominent structure. In a similar vein, Holland and Ickler (1978) have maintained that in the inherited IE relative constructions (Exx. (7), (9), (27), (28)) the relative adjectives (both those from **i*o- and those from **k*wi-) serve to mark their nouns as topics in at least one other clause.

From a formal and from a functional point of view, the presentational sentences containing *tis* in Greek are identical to the first half of a relative sentence of the inherited type: in these sentences *tis* is clearly an adjective, and the noun it marks is always thematic; as stated above, a noun so marked is invariably the subject of a following (short) story.⁵

Notes

1. There has been a certain amount of discussion about which of the two meanings is primary. Meillet-Vendryes (1927:549) believe on semantic grounds that the indefinite is older, while H. Frei (1940:8ff.) cites non-IE parallels for a shift from interrogative to indefinite to support his thesis. P. Kretschmer (1927:62) comes closest to a solution of this question in that he maintains (following P. H. Wegener) that an interrogative "ein betontes Indefinitum sei. D.h. ein betontes und an den Anfang des Satzes gestelltes irgendwer soll den Angeredeten reizen, über diese Person, wenn er es

kann, Aufschluss zu geben. Dieser Anreiz zur Antwort ist aber eben das, was wir Frage nennen." What indefinites and interrogatives have in common is that they both presuppose further information about the modificand.

2. hóstis spreads at the expense of hós in later Greek (Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:643); in fact, in Homer too there are often no clear boundaries between the use of the two forms. One place where hóstis has specific reference is

Éspete nŭn moi, Moŭsai, Olŭmpia dŏmat' ékhousai
 tell now me Muses Olympian dwellings having
hós tis dè prŏtos Agamémnonos antíon ělthen
 who tis ptc. first Agamemnon against came
 ě autŏn Trŏŏn ě ě kleitŏn epikourŏn
 either themselves Trojans or famed allies

'Tell me now, Muses (who) have Olympian dwellings,
 who tis first came against Agamemnon
 either of the Trojans themselves or of the famed allies.'
 (Il.11.218-220; Ex. (5) contains the two succeeding lines.)

Another such usage occurs at Il.14.508-511.

3. I use this reconstruction as a kind of shorthand, subsuming the forms with different vowel grades.
4. The correspondences include preposed relative clauses in Latin and Osco-Umbrian, the use of relatives with demonstratives, and the existence of the compound relative Hitt. kuiš kuiš, Lat. quisquis 'whoever', Osc. pitpit 'quicquid' in Festus' gloss. Sturtevant's view on the repartition of *io- and *k^ui- cannot, I think, be seriously defended.
5. The marginal survival of forms derived from IE *k^ui- as topic markers in a language which otherwise uses a reflex of IE *io- as relative has parallels in Avestan and in Old Indic. Avestan -ciŭ (from IE *k^uid) is used in two basic values (Bartholomae 1904: s.v., Reichelt 1909:289): first, as an "emphasizing" particle, second, as a generalizing or indefinite particle when added to relatives or to interrogatives. Old Indic cid is used under much the same conditions (Delbrück 1888:478). In both cases, further modification is the usual concomitant of the use of these particles. I propose to treat this matter in detail in another place.

References

- Bartholomae, Chr. 1904. Altiranisches Wörterbuch. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1948. Grammaire homérique. Tome I. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Delbrück, B. 1888. Altindische Syntax. Strassburg: Trübner.
- _____. 1900. Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. Dritter Theil. Strassburg: Trübner.

- Frei, Henri. 1940. Interrogatif et indéfini. Paris: Geuthner.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1930. Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches. 2. Teil (= Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft. 34. Band 1. Heft) Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Hahn, E. Adelaide. 1946. The Origin of the relative kwi- kwo-. Language 22.68-85.
- _____. 1969. Naming-Constructions. Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association Number 27. Case Western Reserve University.
- Humbert, Jean. 1954. Syntaxe grecque. Deuxième édition. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Holland, Gary and Ickler, Nancy. 1978. Some Observations on Relatives and Demonstratives in Greek and Sanskrit. Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 432-445.
- Justus, Carol. 1976. Relativization and Topicalization in Hittite. Subject and Topic, ed. Charles Li, 215-245. New York: Academic Press.
- Kieckers, Ernst. 1911. Die Stellung des Verbs im Griechischen und in den verwandten Sprachen. Erster Teil. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Kretschmer, Paul. 1927. Sprache. Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft I, Dritte Auflage, ed. A Gercke and E. Norden. (Separate pagination.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner.
- Kühner, R. and Gerth, B. 1955 (=1904). Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Satzlehre Erster Teil. Vierte Auflage. Leverkusen: Gottschalk.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1965 (=1916). Le renouvellement des conjonctions. Linguistique historique et linguistique générale, 159-174. Paris: Champion.
- _____ and Vendryes, J. 1927. Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques. Deuxième tirage revu. Paris: Champion.
- Reichelt, Hans. 1909. Awestisches Elementarbuch. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Schwyzler, Eduard and Debrunner, Albert. 1950. Griechische Grammatik. Zweiter Band. Syntax. München: Beck.
- Senn, Alfred. 1957. Handbuch der litauischen Sprache. Band II. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Sturtevant, E. H. 1930. Relatives in Indo-European and Hittite. Language Monograph No. 7 (Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies, ed. J. Hatfeld et al.), 141-149.